

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/632,337 08/01/2003 3585 Thomas E. Strangman H0004563 7590 12/09/2004 EXAMINER Honeywell International, Inc. NGUYEN, NINH H Law Dept. AB2 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER P.O. Box 2245 Morristown, NJ 07962-9806 3745

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			100
Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del>('\\\</del>
	10/632,337	STRANGMAN, THOMA	AS E.
	Examiner	Art Unit	<del></del>
	Ninh H. Nguyen	3745	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address	s
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF	PLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MG	ONTH(S) FROM	
<ul> <li>THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION</li> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a relative to reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>	1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- reply within the statutory minimum of thirty od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tute, cause the application to become ABA	r (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this commur ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·		
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ T	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	·	·	rits is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex par</i> te <i>Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application	on.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) 33-38 is/are withdo	rawn from consideration.		
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>28,29 and 31</u> is/are rejected.			
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>30 and 32</u> is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 August 2003</u> is/ar	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obj	ected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	he drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	ection is required if the drawing(	s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-1	52.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority docume</li> </ol>	ents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in Ap	oplication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	riority documents have been	received in this National Stag	je
application from the International Bure	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a I	ist of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date	
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/	08) 5) 🔲 Notice of In	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/01/03</u> .	6) Other:	<b>-</b> ·	

Application/Control Number: 10/632,337 Page 2

Art Unit: 3745

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

I. Claims 1-32, drawn to a turbine component comprising an integral ring of single crystal turbine airfoils, classified in class 416, subclass 234.

II. Claims 33-38, drawn to a method of manufacturing such a turbine component, classified in class 164, subclass 122.2.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 1. Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the turbine component can be made by bonding singly cast single crystal turbine blades to a turbine disk.
- 2. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- During a telephone conversation with Robert Desmond, Reg. No. 38,430 on 11/16/04 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-32. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 33-38 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/632,337 Page 3

Art Unit: 3745

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 28 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gemma et al. (4,605,452).

Gemma discloses an integral ring of single crystal turbine airfoils (product by process; Figs. 1-6) made from a nickel-based superalloy (col. 4, lines 32-34).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gemma et al. in view of DeLuca et al. (5,900,084).

Gemma discloses all the limitations except the turbine component does not have anisotropic properties as claimed.

DeLuca teaches turbine vanes and blades are made of anisotropic single crystal and columnar grain alloys to allow higher operating temperature of the turbine to obtain higher efficiency (col. 1, lines 44-51).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to make the integral ring of single crystal turbine airfoils of Gemma with the blades made of anisotropic single crystal alloys for the purpose of increasing operating temperature of the airfoils to obtain higher efficiency for the turbine as taught by DeLuca.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 8. Claims 1-8, due to the limitation of a defined crystallographic mismatch between adjacent single crystal turbine airfoils, are allowed.
- 9. Claims 9-19, due to the limitation of the average crystallographic orientation changes between adjacent single crystal turbine airfoils by 360/n degrees, are allowed.
- 10. Claims 20-27, due to the limitation of the crystallographic orientation changes between adjacent single crystal turbine airfoils alternate from zero degrees to approximately 360/(0.5n) degrees, are allowed.
- 11. Claims 30 and 32, due to the specific grain boundary misorientation and the specific alloy composition, respectively, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Prior Art

The prior art made of record but not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and consists of 1 patent.

Shah et al. (4,915,907) is cited to show an anisotropy singly crystal alloy.

Art Unit: 3745

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Examiner Ninh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4823. The examiner can be normally reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Edward Look, can be reached at (571) 272-4820. The fax number for this group is

703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, please go to http://pair-direct.uspto.gov or contact the Electronic Business center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RIMARY EXAMINER

Nhn

November 19, 2004